

**REMARKS**

In light of the amendments above and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Claims 2-11, 13, 14, 16-25, 27, and 28 and amended claims 1, 12, 15, and 26 are in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner required a new title that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The title has been amended herein.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,556,590 to Saeijs.

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part as follows:

“A method for transmitting data in which the data is transmitted from an electronic equipment to other electronic equipment on a network in which a plurality of electronic equipment are connected over a serial bus interface, comprising:

a detection step of detecting the timing of inserting discontinuity information data into contents of the data on said electronic equipment to be recorded and/or reproduced for a recording medium on said other electronic equipment on said network, said discontinuity information data indicating the discontinuity of said contents...”

It is respectfully submitted that Saeijs as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Saeijs”) does not appear to disclose the above features of amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Saeijs.

For reasons similar to those described above, amended independent claims 12 and 15 are believed to be distinguishable from Saeijs.

Claims 2-7, 10, 13, 14, 16-21, and 24 depend from one of claims 1, 12, and 15, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Saeijs for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,786,845 to Tsuria in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,099 to Smith.

Independent claim 26, as amended herein, recites in part as follows:

“An electronic equipment in which the data is transmitted from an electronic equipment to other electronic equipment on a network constructed by connecting a plurality of electronic equipment over a serial bus interface, comprising:

...

said generating means inserting the generated discontinuity information data into contents of data on said electronic equipment to be recorded and/or reproduced for a recording medium on said other electronic equipment on said network, wherein said data is received through said tuning means.”

It is respectfully submitted that the applied combination of Tsuria and Smith does not appear to disclose the above features of amended independent claim 26. Accordingly, claim 26 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Tsuria and Smith.

Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 26, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Tsuria and Smith for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 1, 8-9, 11, 15, 22-23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuria in view of Smith and U.S. Patent No. 6,529,246 to Maeda.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to amended independent claim 26, amended independent claims 1 and 15 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Tsuria and Smith. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Maeda to overcome the above-described deficiencies of the applied combination of Tsuria and Smith. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 15 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Tsuria, Smith, and Maeda.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 22, 23, and 25 depend from one of claims 1 and 15, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Tsuria, Smith, and Maeda for at least the reasons previously described.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800